



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

NV  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,211	06/20/2003	Steven Bruce Michlin		7306
7590	12/22/2004		EXAMINER	
Steven Bruce Michlin 6771 Cottonwood Knoll West Bloomfield, MI 48322			LEE, SUSAN SHUK YIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2852	

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The timely submission under 37 CFR 1.129(a) filed on 9/24/04 is not fully responsive to the prior Office action because of the following reasons:

1. The amendment was filed with numbers to indicate line number in the left hand margins that are too close to the body of the amendment. For example, claim 3 in the amendment filed 9/24/04 looks like claim 203 and claim 10 looks like claim 2010. This is also true for the amendment to the specification.
2. The claims have not been corrected to obviate the objections that were made in the Ex Parte Quayle action mailed out 3/29/04. Examples are in claim 10, line 6, and claim 25, line 6, "a second release liner layer" is unclear. Where is the first release liner layer or release liner layer? There are additional errors too numerous to mention. Applicant is advised to check the previous office action for the objections made.
3. The amendment also raises new objections to the claims. Example of such is in claim 26, line 4, "said at least one masking region" lacks antecedent basis. There are additional new errors too numerous to mention. Applicant is advised to carefully review the amendment to correct the new errors. Claims 27, 31, 33, 35, and 37 were found to have new errors.
4. The new abstract does not comply with MPEP sect. 608.01 (b) because it is still too long. It has more than 150 words. As stated in the previous office action, abstracts should not exceed 150 words.
5. "Prior Art" was removed from originally filed figs. 36, 37, 3C, 3D, 3E, 34 and 35. This is not acceptable and raises a new matter issue, 35 U.S.C. 112, first

paragraph, the written description requirement. In addition, the applicant supports the removal by explaining they are in the parent case 08/370,968, now US Patent No. 6,552,780. This is not acceptable since applicant has not pointed out where in the parent case these figures are shown. The description of the elements in the figures of the instant application do not coincide with the description of the elements in the figures of 08/370,968. In addition, the description of the figures in the instant invention's specification describes some of the figures mentioned above as prior art.

6. Applicant did not reply to the paragraph in the previous office action that mentioned the use of trademarks should be accompanied by generic terminology.

Since the submission appears to be a *bona fide* attempt to provide a complete reply to the prior Office action, applicant is given a shortened statutory period of ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS from the mailing date of this letter, whichever is longer, to submit a complete reply. This shortened statutory period supersedes the time period set in the prior Office action. This time period may be extended pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a). If a notice of appeal and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) were filed prior to or with the payment of the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(r), the payment of the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(r) by applicant is construed as a request to dismiss the appeal and to continue prosecution under 37 CFR 1.129(a). The appeal stands dismissed.

An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in

this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

Applicant is advised of the availability of the publication "Attorneys and Agents Registered to Practice Before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office." This publication is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan S. Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-2137. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri., 10:30-8:00, Second Monday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Art Grimley can be reached on 571-272-2136 or 571-272-2800 (Ext. 52). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Susan S. Lee  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2852

sl